

Remarks

The Applicants have amended Claims 1, 50 and 59 to improve their clarity and readability.

Claims 10 and 59 have been amended to change the depths of 0.5-1 mm to 3-5 mm. Similarly, the specification has been amended on page 29 in paragraph [0085] to recite a “fine clearance 25 of about 1 mm.” The Applicants note that the “1-10 mm gap” depth is described in paragraph [0032] as well as originally-filed Claim 12.

Finally, Claims 1 and 59 have been amended to change the process language into positive apparatus descriptions.

Entry of the above changes into the official file is respectfully requested.

Claims 50 and 59 stand objected to with respect to potentially amending those claims to describe the features and terms of physical features of the mold. As noted above, the Applicants have amended both of Claims 50 and 59 to make those changes. The Applicants have also amended Claim 59 in accordance with the Examiner’s helpful suggestion. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 10 and 59 stand rejected under 35 USC §112 as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Applicants have amended both of those claims as noted above to change the gap depths for example, and have also amended the specification to account for these changes. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 59 stands rejected under 35 USC §112 as being indefinite. As noted above, Claim 59 has been amended to cure this deficiency. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 5, 7, 13, 16-19, 50, 54, 56, 62, 65 and 66-69 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 over the combination of Advani and Loving with Sekido. The Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner’s detailed comments hypothetically applying that combination against those claims. The Applicants nonetheless respectfully submit that the combination fails to result in the subject matter as recited in those claims. Details follow.

As noted above the mold for molding as recited in Claim 50 was said to comprise a plurality of molds. However, Claim 50 also recites a pair of dies and specifies those dies as an upper die and a lower die. Support is found in the Applicants’ specification in paragraph [0079] and Figs. 1-4 of the drawings.

In addition to specifying the presence of the upper die and lower die, the position of the groove is also now recited. Thus, even if Sekido, Advani and Loving are combined, between the intermediate plate and the upper die, a deformable sheet such as deformable member 140 is required, and it is necessary to open/close the hole provided in the groove of the plate using a mechanical piston such as the gate control system 150.

On the other hand, in Claim 1 and 50, a deformable sheet such as the one disclosed in Advani is not necessary between the intermediate plate and the upper die since it is constructed so that resin is distributed through the groove formed on the surface of the intermediate plate and the resin is injected in the thickness direction of the reinforcing fiber substrate almost simultaneously. This is the case even for a relatively large three-dimensional body without causing a region where resin does not flow ... wherein the time for molding can be greatly shortened and it becomes possible to increase the production speed and production amount as recited in paragraph [0067] of the Applicants' specification.

The Applicants therefore respectfully submit that one skilled in the art would not have a reasonable expectation that even if the above-mentioned publications were hypothetically combined, that such a combination would result in the subject matter as recited in Claims 1 and 50. That combination would result in a completely different structure. Withdrawal of the rejection is accordingly respectfully requested.

Claims 14, 15, 63 and 64 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 over the further combination of Waldrop with Advani, Loving and Sekido. The Applicants respectfully submit, however, that Waldrop fails to cure the deficiencies set forth above with respect to the primary and secondary references. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 20-23 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 over the further combination of Freitas with Advani, Loving and Sekido. The Applicants respectfully submit, however, that Freitas fails to cure the deficiencies set forth above with respect to the primary and secondary references. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that the entire application is now in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



T. Daniel Christenbury
Reg. No. 31,750
Attorney for Applicants

TDC/vp
(215) 656-3381